

Massachusetts Water Resources Commission
Meeting Minutes for April 10, 1997

Commission Members in Attendance:

Mark Smith	Designee, Secretary of Environmental Affairs
Marilyn Contreas	Designee, Secretary of Housing and Community Development
Richard H. Thibedeau	Designee, Department of Environmental Management
Arleen O'Donnell	Designee, Department of Environmental Protection
Lee Corte-Real	Designee, Department of Food and Agriculture
Karen Pelto	Designee, Department of Fisheries, Wildlife and Environmental Law Enforcement
Gary Clayton	Public Member
Frank Veale	Public Member
Jane Mead	Designee, Massachusetts Office of Coastal Zone Management(non-voting member)

Others in Attendance:

Lou Wagner	Massachusetts Audubon
Vicki Gartland	DEM, Office of Water Resources
Mike Gildesgame	DEM, Office of Water Resources
Eileen Simonson	WSCAC
Glenn Haas	DEP
Lealdon Langley	DEP, Bureau of Resource Protection
Dave Terry	DEP, Bureau of Resource Protection
Steve Pearlman	DEP, Bureau of Resource Protection
Robert Leitch	Dufresne-Henry, Inc.

Agenda Item #1: Executive Director's Report:

Smith reported on the status of the Rivers Protection Act Regulations which will be going to public hearings in May. Smith also reported on the Charles River cso (combined sewer overflow) forum hosted by the Charles River Watershed Association (CRWA) which he and Arleen O'Donnell attended. One point made at the forum is that the draft facilities cso plan from MWRA is not sufficient according to EPA and the CRWA and there is debate over suggested changes.

Smith also announced that the new designee for the Department of Food and Agriculture would be Jeff Kappel.

Agenda Item #2: Adoption of the Minutes of July 11, 1996 meeting

A motion was made by Contreas and seconded by Corte-Real to

ADOPT THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF MARCH 13, 1997.
The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item #3: Presentation: New Source Approval Coordination with the Water Management Program at DEP

Langley described the Water Supply Application Guidelines which have been update to codify the Water Management Program and New Source Approval Program relationship. The goals of updating the guidelines are: to get the Water Management Act Program (WMA) in early to the source development process to guide communities which are looking at environmentally sensitive sources before they have made large investments, and to save time in the regulatory process. The steps in the process are summarized in the guidelines as well as the points where other agency permits should be pursued.

Terry explained that sites are turned down in the site examination step for water quality reasons. Langley said that the WMA has no authority to turn down a site for environmental reasons but relies on limiting the safe yield of the site later in the process. O'Donnell suggested that the Watershed Initiative Teams should be active in the site examination and raise flags where they see issues arising.

Agenda Item #4: Presentation and Vote: Restoration of Portions to 314 CMR 4.00. Surface Water Quality Standards.

Amendments of February 1996 to the 314 CMR 4.00 Water Quality Standards were accidentally deleted and not printed in all draft version distributed for review. Therefore the WRC must re-affirm a previous vote on the standards.

A motion was made by Veale and seconded by O'Donnell to

APPROVE THE RESTORATION OF PORTIONS OF THE 314 CMR 4.00
STANDARDS, AS PRESENTED; PARTICULARLY SEC. 4.03, 4.04, 4.05 AND 4.06.

The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item #5: Discussion: Draft #4, WRC Action Items for 1997.

Smith summarized the actions listed in the handout provided.

O'Donnell suggested the #4, review of sewer extension permits, is not appropriate because it would occur too late in the sewerage process for most communities. O'Donnell also suggested that #5, review 25-year plan to protect rivers, be done soon to coordinate with the draft River Protection regulations alternatives analysis.

Contreas pointed out that DHCD has no required master plan format, #1, but provides communities with a guide including information that communities might want to consider when doing plans.

Pelto suggested #2 A., develop a unified instream flow policy, be more clearly worded to emphasize development of a policy which covers all flow conditions, not just low flows.

Gartland presented a summary of the proposed USGS study of the Ipswich River Basin, #2 A., which is intended to provide baseline hydrologic data for preparation of an Ipswich River Master Plan. One focus of the study will be ground water-surface water interactions especially as they relate to water supply withdrawals.

Simonson suggested enabling legislation to provide drought emergency language, #2 B., which could be adopted by communities.

Meeting minutes approved 6/12/97